

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks which follow.

DISPOSITION OF CLAIMS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9-10 are pending in this application. Claims 3 and 8 have been canceled.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5958809) in view of Ohashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6143676). Claims 3 and 8 have been canceled, but the limitations of claims 3 and 8 have been incorporated in claims 1 and 6, respectively. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9-10 is respectfully requested.

Fujiwara et al. and Ohashi et al. considered in combination do not teach a fused silica glass having the combination of limitations recited in amended claims 1 and 6. In particular, Fujiwara et al. and Ohashi et al. do not teach a fused silica member exhibiting a change in transmittance of less than 0.005/cm after the member has been irradiated with 1×10^{10} shots of 193 nm laser at 1.0 mJ/cm²/pulse, as recited in amended claims 1 and 6.

From the foregoing, claims 1 and 6 as amended are not obvious over Fujiwara et al. in view of Ohashi et al. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6 over Fujiwara et al. in view of Ohashi et al. is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 10, being dependent from claim 1 or 6, are likewise patentable in view of the foregoing arguments.

B. Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6656860) in view of Ohashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6143676). Claims 3 and 8 have been canceled, but the limitations of claims 3 and 8 have been incorporated in claims 1 and 6, respectively. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9-10 is respectfully requested.

Yoshida et al. teach a fused silica glass having a transmission loss no greater than 0.005/cm at 193.4 nm after 1×10^4 pulse irradiation at an energy density of $0.1 \mu\text{J}/\text{cm}^2/\text{pulse}$ to $200 \text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2/\text{pulse}$ (total exposure of $2 \times 10^6 \text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2$). Yoshida et al. do not teach a fused silica glass having a change in transmittance of less than 0.005/cm after the member has been irradiated with 1×10^{10} shots of 193 nm laser at $1.0 \text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2/\text{pulse}$ (total exposure of $1 \times 10^{10} \text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2$), as recited in amended claims 1 and 6. Ohashi et al. fail to overcome the deficiency in Yoshida et al.

From the foregoing, claims 1 and 6 as amended are not obvious over Yoshida et al. in view of Ohashi et al. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6 over Yoshida et al. in view of Ohashi et al. is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 10, being dependent from claim 1 or 6, are likewise patentable in view of the foregoing arguments.

C. Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Komine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6649268). Claims 3 and 8 have been canceled, but the limitations of claims 3 and 8 have been incorporated in claims 1 and 6, respectively. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9-10 is respectfully requested.

Komine et al. teach a fused silica glass having a transmission loss less than 0.2/cm at 193 nm after irradiation with 1×10^6 pulses of light with an energy density of $400 \text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2/\text{pulse}$ (total exposure of $4 \times 10^8 \text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2$). Komine et al. do not teach a fused silica glass having the combination of limitations recited in claims 1 and 6 and a change in transmittance of less than 0.005/cm after irradiation with 1×10^{10} shots of 193 nm laser at $1.0 \text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2/\text{pulse}$ (total exposure of $1 \times 10^{10} \text{ mJ}/\text{cm}^2$).

From the foregoing, claims 1 and 6 as amended are not obvious over Komine et al. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6 over Komine et al. is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 10, being dependent from claim 1 or 6, are likewise patentable in view of the foregoing arguments.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that this paper is fully responsive to the Office Action dated June 2, 2006, and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please apply any charges not covered or credits in connection with this filing to Deposit Account No. 03-3325 (ref. SP01-269A).

Date: November 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Adenike Adebisi

Adenike A. Adebisi

Reg. No. 42,254

Tel.: (281) 856-8646